arXiv:hep-ph/0406247v1 23 Jun 2004

TOKUSHIMA Report
(hep-ph/0406247)

New-Physics Search in $\gamma\gamma \to t\bar{t}$ *

Zenrō HIOKI *)

Institute of Theoretical Physics, University of Tokushima
Tokushima 770-8502, JAPAN

ABSTRACT

We performed an analysis on possible anomalous top-quark couplings generated by $SU(2) \times U(1)$ gauge-invariant dimension-6 effective operators, applying the optimal-observable procedure to the final lepton/b-quark momentum distribution in $\gamma\gamma \to t\bar{t} \to \ell X/bX$. We studied how many such anomalous coupling constants could be determined altogether through these distributions.

---

[*] Talk at *International Workshop on Physics and Experiments with Future Electron-Positron Linear Colliders (LCWS2004)*, April 19-23, 2004, Le Carre des Sciences, Paris, France.
This work is based on collaboration with B. Grzadkowski (Warsaw U), K.Ohkuma (Fukui U Tech) and J. Wudka (UC Riverside).

*) E-mail address: `hioki@ias.tokushima-u.ac.jp`

Linear colliders of e^+e^- are expected to work as top-quark factories, and therefore a lot of attention has been paid to study possible non-standard top-quark interactions in $e\bar{e} \to t\bar{t}$. An interesting option for such e^+e^- machines would be that of $\gamma\gamma$ collisions, where initial energetic photons are produced via electron and laser-light backward scatterings [1].

Indeed a number of authors have already considered top-quark production and decays in $\gamma\gamma$ collisions in order to study *i*) Higgs-boson couplings to the top quark and photon, or *ii*) anomalous top-quark couplings to the photon (see the ref.list of [2] on relevant papers throughout this report). However, what we will observe in real experiments are combined signals that originate both from the process of top-quark production and, *in addition*, from its decays. Therefore, in our latest articles [2] we studied $\gamma\gamma \to t\bar{t} \to \ell X/bX$, including all possible non-standard interactions together (production and decay), and performed a comprehensive analysis as model-independently as possible. I will give a brief sketch of this work here.

In order to describe possible new-physics effects, we used an effective low-energy Lagrangian [3], i.e., the Standard-Model (SM) Lagrangian modified by the addition of a series of $SU(2) \times U(1)$ gauge-invariant operators $\mathcal{O}_i$, which are suppressed by inverse powers of a new-physics scale $\mathit{\Lambda}$ and whose coefficients α_i parameterize the low-energy effects of this new physics.

Among these $\mathcal{O}_i$, the largest contribution comes from dimension-6 operators, and they are classified into those producing (1) *CP*-conserving $t\bar{t}\gamma$ vertex, (2) *CP*-violating $t\bar{t}\gamma$ vertex, (3) *CP*-conserving $\gamma\gamma H$ vertex, (4) *CP*-violating $\gamma\gamma H$ vertex, and (5) anomalous tbW vertex. On the other hand, the $\nu\ell W$ vertex is assumed to be properly described within the SM.

In order to derive distributions of secondary fermions we have applied the Kawasaki–Shirafuji–Tsai formula [4] with FORM [5] for algebraic manipulations, treating the decaying t and W as on-shell particles. We neglected contributions that are quadratic in non-standard interactions, therefore the angular-energy distributions of the ℓ/b in the $e\bar{e}$ CM frame can be expressed as

$$\frac{d\sigma}{dE_{\ell/b}\,d\cos\theta_{\ell/b}} = f_{\rm SM}(E_{\ell/b},\cos\theta_{\ell/b}) + \sum_i \alpha_i f_i(E_{\ell/b},\cos\theta_{\ell/b}), \qquad (1)$$

where $f_{\rm SM}$ and f_i ($i = \gamma 1, \gamma 2, h1, h2, d$) are calculable functions: $f_{\rm SM}$ denotes the standard-model contribution, $f_{\gamma 1,\gamma 2}$ describe the anomalous CP-conserving and CP-violating $t\bar{t}\gamma$-vertices contributions respectively, $f_{h1,h2}$ those generated by the anomalous CP-conserving and CP-violating $\gamma\gamma H$-vertices, and f_d that by the anomalous tbW-vertex. The initial-state polarizations are characterized by the incident electron and positron longitudinal polarizations P_e and $P_{\bar{e}}$, the average helicities of the initial-laser photons P_γ and $P_{\tilde{\gamma}}$, and their maximum average linear polarizations P_t and $P_{\tilde{t}}$.

We applied the optimal-observable procedure [6] to eq.(1) assuming $\sqrt{s_{e\bar{e}}} = 500$ GeV, and tried to estimate the expected statistical precision for α_i determination for both linear and circular e/γ polarizations. Leaving its detail to our article [2], let me here briefly summarize the result: We found no numerically-stable solutions in analyses with three (or more) free parameters although we first aimed to determine the five parameters α_i altogether.[♯1] We however found stable solutions in two-parameter analyses for the following sets: ($\alpha_{\gamma 2}$, α_d), (α_{h1}, α_d), (α_{h2}, α_d) for ℓX, and ($\alpha_{\gamma 2}$, α_{h1}), ($\alpha_{\gamma 2}$, α_d), (α_{h1}, α_{h2}), (α_{h1}, α_d), (α_{h2}, α_d) for bX.

We did not find any solution that would allow for a determination of $\alpha_{\gamma 1}$ for either ℓX or bX. We therefore have to look for other suitable processes to determine this parameter. The precision of $\alpha_{\gamma 2}$ is not very good either, but using b-quark gives still much better result than in the case of the lepton analysis. On the other hand, we found that analyzing the b-quark process with linearly polarized beams enables us to estimate some α_i that were unstable in the lepton analysis, i.e., cases ($\alpha_{\gamma 2}$, α_{h1}) and (α_{h1}, α_{h2}). One of them, (α_{h1}, α_{h2}), is especially useful to probe the CP properties of heavy Higgs bosons. As for the determination of α_d, the ℓX final state seems to be more appropriate. These comparisons show that both final states (bX and ℓX) provide complementary information and should therefore be included in a complete analysis.

Some non-standard couplings, which should be determined here, could also be studied in the standard e^+e^- option of a linear collider. Therefore, it is worth while

---

[♯1] Note however that our result never means there remains no longer any hope for such analyses with three or more free parameters since we only used some typical beam polarizations. We should study various other beam polarizations comprehensively to get the final answer.

to compare the potential power of the two options. As far as the parameter $\alpha_{\gamma 1}$ is concerned, the $\gamma\gamma$ collider does not allow for its determination, while it could be determined at e^+e^-. The second $t\bar{t}\gamma$ coupling $\alpha_{\gamma 2}$, which is proportional to the real part of the top-quark electric dipole moment, can be measured here. For the measurement of $\gamma\gamma H$ couplings, e^+e^- colliders are, of course, useless, while here, for the bX final state both α_{h1} and α_{h2} could be measured. In the case of the decay form factor α_d measurement, the e^+e^- option seems to be a little more advantageous, especially if e^+e^- polarization can be tuned appropriately, which we found in our previous work.

It should be emphasized finally that our effective-operator strategy is valid only for $\Lambda \gg v \simeq 250$ GeV, in contrast to the analysis of $e^+e^- \to t\bar{t} \to \ell X$. Should the reaction $\gamma\gamma \to t\bar{t} \to \ell X/bX$ exhibit a deviation from the SM predictions that cannot be described properly within this framework, we would have an indication of low-energy beyond-the-SM physics, e.g., two-Higgs-doublet models with new scalar degrees of freedom of relatively low mass scale.

REFERENCES

[1] I.F. Ginzburg, G.L. Kotkin, V.G. Serbo and V.I. Telnov, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth.* **205** (1983) 47.

[2] B. Grzadkowski, Z. Hioki, K. Ohkuma and J. Wudka, *Nucl. Phys.* **B689** (2004) 108 (hep-ph/0310159); *Phys. Lett.* **B 593** (2004) 189 (hep-ph/0403174).

[3] W. Buchmüller and D. Wyler, *Nucl. Phys.* **B268** (1986) 621.

[4] Y.S. Tsai, *Phys. Rev.* **D4** (1971) 2821; *ibid.* **13** (1976) 771(Erratum);
S. Kawasaki, T. Shirafuji and S.Y. Tsai, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **49** (1973) 1656.

[5] J.A.M. Vermaseren, "*Symbolic Manipulation with FORM*", version 2, Tutorial and Reference Manual, CAN, Amsterdam 1991, ISBN 90-74116-01-9.

[6] D. Atwood and A. Soni, *Phys. Rev.* **D45** (1992) 2405;
M. Davier, L. Duflot, F. Le Diberder and A. Rouge, *Phys. Lett.* **B306** (1993)

411;

M. Diehl and O. Nachtmann, *Z. Phys.* **C**62 (1994) 397;

J.F. Gunion, B. Grzadkowski and X.G. He, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77** (1996) 5172 (hep-ph/9605326).